APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,707	12/26/2001	DeWayne L. Hays	MET580/4-1	4190

22893   7590   06/08/2004

VINSON & ELKINS L.L.P.
1001 FANNIN STREET
2300 FIRST CITY TOWER
HOUSTON, TX 77002-6760

EXAMINER
FERNANDES, CHERYL M.

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/035,707	HAYS ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Cheryl M Fernandes	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 January 2003_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _09 January 2003_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1.   The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance

with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is

required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

> The oath or declaration is defective because:
> It does not include the date that the oath was signed by one of the inventors.

2.   Applicant has not given a post office address anywhere in the application papers

as required by 37 CFR 1.33(a), which was in effect at the time of filing of the oath or

declaration. A statement over applicant's signature providing a complete post office

address is required.

Drawings

3.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

-    Fig. 5 does not mention parts 5A-5C in the specification;

-    Fig. 15 does not mention parts 15C-15E in the specification;

-    Fig. 16 does not mention parts 16H-16N in the specification.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office

action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not

be held in abeyance.

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the

description:

- Elements of Fig. 19A-H in paragraph 97 are not included in the drawings or the brief description;

- Elements of Fig. 20 in paragraph 110 are not included in the drawings or the brief description.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the incident code searchable by the database must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The incident code recited in claim 4 is not provided for in the specification. Examiner suggests replacing 'event code' with 'incident code' in the disclosure to allow the specification to be enabling for the ability to search by incident code.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not include any mention of incident code, incident code information or the fact that the database is searchable by incident code information.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claims 4, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9.   Claim 4 recites the limitation "the database comprises a plurality of files associated with at least one incident code and wherein the database is searchable by incident code information" in lines 1-3. However, the specification provides no mention of incident code, incident code information or the fact that the database is searchable by incident code information. Although the specification includes mention of an event code,

there has been no similarity drawn between an incident code and an event code.

Therefore, in the interest of compact prosecution the incident code is taken to mean

event code.

10.   Claim 23 recites the limitation "said means for allowing a user to (select and)

download information" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the

downloading of information in the claim.

11.   Claim 24 recites the limitation "said means for allowing a user ...to (select and)

download information" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the

downloading of information in the claim.

Due to the vagueness and a lack of clear definition of the terminology and

phrases used in the specification and claims, the claims have been treated on their

merits as best understood by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12.   Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US

Patent Number 5,920,856 issued to Syeda-Mahmood.

13.   Referring to claim 1, Syeda-Mahmood discloses:

A method of providing security services ('surveillance', Background, lines 12-19[1]) to a client comprising the steps of:

- maintaining a database of information ('meta-database', see Abstract) which relates to security services for a client (Fig. 1, element 3, col. 5, lines 12-17), wherein the database comprises a plurality of text files (col. 5, lines 48-65), comprising at least portions of reports from security officers ('form of expected query', col. 5, lines 51-54);

- performing a search of the database ('search agent' in Fig. 1, element 2; see col. 5, lines 12-17; 31-33) in response to a search request received ('user query', Fig. 2, element 6, col. 5, lines 31-33; col. 8, lines 38-45) via the Internet from a computer (see 'web server' and 'web clients' in Fig. 1); and

- providing the results of the search of the database (col. 6, lines 30-35 and 39-46; col. 7, lines 3-4, 46-58) via the Internet to the computer from which the search request was received (col. 8, lines 50-53; client receives results from web server, see col. 9, lines 21-38).

14. Referring to claim 5, Syeda-Mahmood discloses a plurality of image files ('Website Image Database', 'Website Image + Text Database', Fig. 1, element 1; col. 10, lines 15-36).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

---

[1] Surveillance is defined as a security service on page 2 of specification, lines 3-5.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15.   Claims 1-2, 4, 6-9, 11-12, 15, 17-19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,173,284 B1 issued to

Brown.

16.   Referring to claim 1, Brown discloses:

A method of providing security services (monitoring 'police reports', Abstract; see

col. 1, lines 21-50 for mention of service provided) to a client comprising the steps of:

- maintaining a database of information (see Abstract for monitoring information

    in a police database) which relates to security services for a client (desktop

    and laptop computers, police car, Fig. 2, element 30, col. 6, lines 35-46),

    wherein the database comprises a plurality of text files, comprising at least

    portions of reports from security officers ('police reports', see Abstract; police

    records', col. 3, lines 31-34);

- performing a search of the database (col. 2, line 64- col. 3, line 7) in response

    to a search request received via the Internet from a computer ('search query'

    see col. 2, line 64- col. 3, line 5; col. 5, lines 44-46); and

- providing the results of the search of the database ('notification signal', col. 3,

    lines 5-10; 'notification message', col. 5, lines 54-59) via the Internet to the

    computer from which the search request was received (col. 3, lines 11-26;

col. 5, lines 44-59, col. 10, line 61- col. 11, line 9; col. 11, lines 33-36 and 41-

46).

17.   Referring to claim 2, Brown discloses a plurality of files associated with a plurality

of client sites and wherein the database is searchable by client site information

('location of activity', col. 7, lines 45-53).

18.   Referring to claim 3, Brown discloses a plurality of files associated with at least

one date and wherein the database is searchable by date information ('date of activity',

col. 7, lines 45-53).

19.   Referring to claim 6, Brown discloses adding information regarding security

services for a client to the database and updating the information provided to a client via

the Internet (col. 10, lines 41-44).

20.   Referring to claim 7, Brown discloses:

A method of providing security services (monitoring 'police reports', Abstract; see

col. 1, lines 21-50 for mention of service provided) to a client comprising the steps of:

-     providing new information regarding security services (see col. 9, lines 11-50,

and col. 10, lines 12-39) for at least one client (desktop and laptop computers,

police car, Fig. 2, element 30, col. 6, lines 35-46) from a first computer at a

first location ('desktop computer', Fig. 2, element 30; 'user interface device',

col. 6, lines 35-39) to a database stored in memory of a second computer at a

second location ('database server', 'search database', Fig. 6, elements 36

and 148[2]), wherein the database comprises a plurality of text files relating to security services ('police reports', see Abstract; 'police records') for the at least one client;

- updating the database with the new information (col. 10, lines 27-45);

- maintaining a web site accessible via the Internet ('front-end web page', col. 7, lines 7-12), wherein the database is accessible to a visitor ('police officer', see col. 7, lines 7-25) of the web site via the Internet ('police records database' accessed by 'query information form', col. 7, lines 7-38); and

- allowing the visitor to view information from the database via the Internet ('notification message' col. 7, lines 31-44; col. 5, lines 54-59; col. 10, line 61-col. 11, line 46).

21.   Referring to claim 8, Brown discloses receiving a request for information from the visitor ('search query', see col. 2, line 64- col. 3, line 5; col. 5, lines 44-49, Fig. 5, elements 32,14; Fig. 3, elements 30,12) and providing information from the database to the web site in response to a request for information from the client ('notification signal', col. 3, lines 5-10; 'notification message', col. 5, lines 54-59).

22.   Referring to claim 9, Brown discloses requiring the visitor of the web site to provide an authorization code before viewing any information from the database ('password', col. 7, lines 7-16).

23.   Referring to claim 11, Brown discloses:

---

[2] The database server computer contains in its memory a search database containing replicas of the police report database records.

A method of obtaining information regarding security services (monitoring 'police

reports', Abstract; see col. 1, lines 21-50 for mention of service provided), comprising

the steps of:

accessing via the Internet ('communications network' (Fig. 2, element 34), col.

8, lines 38-40), from a first computer at a first location ('desktop computer',

Fig. 2, element 30; 'user interface device', col. 6, lines 35-39), a database

stored on a second computer at a second location, remote from the first

location ('Web server', Fig. 2, element 32), wherein the database comprises a

plurality of text files, comprising at least portions of reports of security

personnel ('police reports', see Abstract; 'police records', col. 3, lines 31-34),

and relating to security services (see Abstract for police database security

services) for at least one client (desktop and laptop computers, police car,

Fig. 2, element 30, col. 6, lines 35-46);

- sending, from the first computer via the Internet to the second computer, a

search request for selected files from the database ('search query', see col. 2,

line 64- col. 3, line 5; col. 5, lines 44-49, Fig. 5, elements 32,14; Fig. 3,

elements 30,12 [3]);

- receiving in response to the search request information regarding the files of

the database that have information relevant to the search request

('notification signal', col. 3, lines 5-10; 'notification message', col. 5, lines 54-

59);

- selecting at least one of the files from the database to be received (col. 9, lines 11-50 and col. 10, lines 48-67[4]); and

- receiving the selected file from the database (col. 10, lines 61-67[5]).

24.   Referring to claim 12, Brown discloses providing the second computer with a password (refer to discussion of claim 9 above).

25.   Referring to claim 17, Brown discloses:

An apparatus for providing information regarding security services (monitoring 'police reports', Abstract; see col. 1, lines 21-50 for mention of service provided), comprising:

- a first computer at a first location ('desktop computer', Fig. 2, element 30; 'user interface device', col. 6, lines 35-39), wherein:

    said first computer is connected to the Internet ('communications network' (Fig. 2, element 34),col. 8, lines 38-40) and

    has a browser software program ('Internet browser program', col. 3, lines 11-14, col. 6, lines 35-39 and 54-60 related to Fig. 3, element 60);

- a second computer at a second location, remote from the first location ('Web server', Fig. 2, element 32), wherein:

---

[3] The search request is sent to server module, an element of the web server, from the user interface module, an element of the user interface device.

[4] The query information form (Fig.4, element 64) allows a user to enter search terms for a report search. The results are sent to the user by the notification module in the form of a notification message that includes a Search ID or record number for the user to then select.

[5] The user can select a Search ID or record number from the search results to further view additional information. Examiner respectfully points out in reference to col. 9, lines 4-7 that the query form is a webpage, and therefore is transferred via the Internet.

said second computer is connected to the Internet ('communications

network' (Fig. 2, element 34),col. 8, lines 25-27, 38-40, and 60-64) and

has a browser software program[6];

- a database comprising security services information (see Abstract for police

database), comprising:

a plurality of text files relating to security services ('police reports',

see Abstract; 'police records') provided to at least one client (desktop and

laptop computers, police car, Fig. 2, element 30, col. 6, lines 35-46) stored

on computer memory ('police records database', Fig. 2, element 18),

accessible by said second computer (col. 9, line 10 - col. 10, line 33[7]);

- means for allowing a user of said first computer ('police officer', col. 10, lines

61-67) to select at least one of the plurality of files from the database

accessible by said second computer ('notification message', col. 9, lines 11-

50 and col. 10, lines 48-67[8]); and

- means for transferring the file selected to said first computer from said second

computer via the Internet , so that the file can be reviewed by the user of said

first computer ('notification module', col. 10, line 61- col. 11, line 9[9]).

26.   Referring to claims 15 and 18, Brown discloses that the database comprises a

plurality of daily activity reports from a plurality of security officers regarding the security

---

[6] Paragraph 45 of the specification defines the server as a program that responds to browser requests by serving Web pages and is commonly referred to as a "Web server." Examiner asserts that a program that responds to browser requests is a browser software program.

[7] The server module within the web server accesses the database server, which then accesses the search database (a replica of the police records database).

[8] See footnote 4.

services for at least one client ('daily' frequency term from dropdown menu (Fig. 4, element 78) allows users to access plurality of daily activity reports from the police database).

27.   Referring to claim 19, Brown discloses that the database comprises a plurality of incident report files from a plurality of security officers regarding the security services for at least one client ('crime reports', col. 4, lines 9-13).

28.   Referring to claim 21, Brown discloses software stored on the second computer, which searches the database in response to a search request, received from the user of the first computer ('server module' software, col. 8, lines 43-46, Fig. 5, element 14).

29.   Referring to claim 22, Brown discloses that the search request comprises alphanumeric information wherein the software is programmed to search the database for data that matches at least some of the alphanumeric information in the search request ('car model', col. 7, lines 45-47, Fig. 4, element 76).

30.   Referring to claims 23 and 24, Brown discloses that means for allowing a user of the first computer to select and download information from the database comprises computer software running on the second computer (server, database, and notification modules[10], see col. 3, lines 35-51), wherein the computer software is programmed to retrieve ('database module', col. 3, lines 35-48) and send ('notification module', col. 3, lines 48-51) selected information from said database to said first computer in response to a signal from said first computer ('notification signal';'query', col. 3, lines 35-51).

---

[9] See footnote 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

31.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown as

applied to claim 1 above.

Referring to claim 4, Brown discloses a plurality of files associates with at least

one incident code and wherein the database is searchable by incident code information

('type of activity' related to problem or crime, col. 7, lines 45-53).

Official notice is taken that it was well known in the art at the time the invention

was made to use codes to designate security event. [See for example, US Patent

Number 5,572,204 issued to Timm et. al, for reference to event codes in col. 8, lines 41-

54.]

It is obvious to use event codes in Brown because they provide a terse and

precise description of an event.

32.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown

as applied to claims 7 and 9 above, and in further view of US Publication Number

US 2004/0024634 A1 by Carp et. al (hereafter Carp).

Referring to claim 10, Brown discloses the limitations of claims 7 and 9.

---

[10] The server, database and notification modules together allow a user to select information from the database by entering a query that relates to the information they choose to search for.

Brown fails to disclose that the information in the database is protected by secure

socket layer encryption.

Carp shows that the information in the database is protected by secure socket

layer encryption (see Paragraph 26 in reference to the accessing of the 'secured portion

of system 1000' (Fig. 1A)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify Brown to include the protection of information in a

database by secure socket layer encryption as taught by Carp.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Brown per the

above for the purpose of the prevention of access of secure portion of the system

website by unauthorized users as well as the protection of privacy of each user

accessing the system (see Paragraph 26).

33.   Claims 13, 14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Brown as applied to claims 11 and 17 above, and further in view of

Syeda-Mahmood.

34.   Referring to claims 13 and 14, Brown discloses the limitations of claim 11.

35.   Referring to claim 20, Brown discloses the limitations of claim 17.

36.   Referring to claim 13, Brown also discloses that the database comprises a

plurality of incident report files (refer to discussion of claim 19 above).

37.   However, referring to claims 13 and 20, Brown fails to disclose that the database

comprises a plurality of visual image files.

Syeda-Mahmood shows that the database comprises a plurality of visual image

files ('Website Image Database', 'Website Image + Text Database' contained within the

Meta-Database, Fig. 1, elements 1 and 2; col. 10, lines 15-36).

38.   Referring to claim 14 Brown fails to disclose that the database comprises a

plurality of video clip files.

Syeda-Mahmood shows that the database comprises a plurality of video clip files

('Website Video Database' contained within the Meta-Database, Fig. 1, element 1 and

2; col. 9, line 50 – col. 10, line 14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify Brown to include a database comprising a plurality of

visual image files and video clip files as taught by Syeda-Mahmood.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Brown per the

above for the purpose of enhancing the effectiveness of database information retrieval

using a multimedia database (col. 8, lines 9-12).

39.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown

as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of US Patent Number 6,538,623 B1

issued to Parnian et. al (hereafter Parnian).

Referring to claim 16, Brown discloses the elements of claim 11.

Brown fails to disclose selection of at least one icon displayed on the first

computer representing a file from the database and clicking on the icon to initiate the

step of downloading the file corresponding to the icon.

Parnian shows selection of at least one icon displayed on a computer representing a file from the database ('SCENEPRO Open icon', col. 39, lines 11-21). Parnian also shows clicking on the icon (col. 10, lines 43-47[11]) to initiate the step of downloading the file corresponding to the icon ('video', col. 11, lines 49-57; col. 12, lines 26-33; 'still image photos', col. 12, lines 46-48).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Brown to include selection of at least one icon displayed on the first computer representing a file from the database and clicking on the icon to initiate the step of downloading the file corresponding to the icon as taught by Parnian.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Brown per the above for the purpose of creating and attaching to the case file a plurality of multi-media inputs of investigation information such as photo images, video and handwritten documents (see col. 15, lines 20-26). In addition, the ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Brown for the purpose of downloading data gathering tools to efficiently decrease the investigation time, enhance evidence handling and the significantly minimize, if not eliminate evidence contamination (see col. 9, lines 7-24).

---

[11] Selection is made by 'handwriting wand or pen' (Fig. 6A and 6B, element 35f) that functions as a mouse.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M Fernandes whose telephone number is (703) 305-3917. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CMF
June 2, 2004

WAYNE AMSBURY
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER